Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee

MINUTES

October 31, 2023
Time: 11:00 AM – 4:00 PM
Zoom information in email

Members Present: Eniko Csomay, Gregory Wood, Paul Carpenter, Samuel Frame, Dana Nakano, Susan Schlievert, Simon Rodan, LaTonya Parker, Bernadette Muscat, Sarah Wood, Genesis “Gali” Pompa, John Stankas, Brent Foster, Michelle Plug, Mark Van Selst
Standing Guests Present: Kevin Katz, Caron Inouye, Marci Sanchez, Bob Quinn, Raul Arambula, Quajuana Chapman
Guest: Interim AVC Massa

1. Call to order and roll call (11:04)
   a. Introductions: Broad goals and areas of particular interest
2. Chair’s welcome and introductory comments
   a. Dropbox, Agenda update
   b. Overview of meeting agenda and flow
3. October Agenda (approved)
   a. Added item 7i.
4. Future meetings (all will be zoom accessible)
   a. January 16 (modality = TBD)
      i. Will be online
   b. March 12 (modality = TBD) May 14 (modality = TBD)
5. September 2023 Minutes approved
6. 2022-23 GEAC Annual Report (dropbox main folder) will be
brought back for approval in November with suggested changes.
   a. No additional changes were forthcoming.
   b. Annual report was approved with one abstention.
7. Segment Reports of Items Relevant to GE
   a. CCC System Office (Stanskas) - Link to report.
      i. Implementation of AB928 and AB1111 - wrapping up their work. AB928
         one more meeting left; set of goals working on including increasing
         transfer rates and closing equity gaps, STEM degrees.
      ii. Public comment open.
      iii. Required to be placed on an AST pathway if one exists. If there is no
         ADT or they choose not to take an ADT provision of AB928 doesn’t
         apply.
            - Number of students pursuing ADTs will vary by college.
            - Implications of UC ADT legislation? No one from the CC system
              was part of the conversation so how this will unfold is unknown.
      iv. Memos around technology and Cal-GETC that need to happen
      v. AB1111 final meeting Dec 11. Required to implement the legislation;
         creating a pathway to do this; won’t make the deadline of July 2024 -
         seeking an extension; but making progress.
   b. CCC Academic Senate (Parker)
      i. Embracing Organizational Change
      ii. Engaging Proactively in Partnerships and Advocacy to Advance Faculty
          Voice and Student Success
          - Rising Scholars and Prison Education
          - CO and ASCCC Collaboration Dual Enrollment and DEIA in
            evaluations webinars
      iii. Developing Innovative Activities to Empower Faculty and Uplift
           Underrepresented Faculty Voices
          - Plenary planning November 16-18, 2023 Fall Plenary Session | ASCCC
          - Planned and held update webinars for AB 1111 and AB 928
            based on draft reports released
          - Leadership and (RP Group) collaborations re: African American
Transfer Tipping Point Study and Findings

iv. Ongoing Operational Activities
   - Faculty involvement in baccalaureate degree applications process

v. Added to Stankas on advising for students transferring into the UC system.

vi. Engaging in advocacy to advance faculty voice and student success.

vii. Collaboration on dual enrollment

viii. DEI webinars.

ix. AB1111 providing support on the implementation of the legislation.

x. https://asccc.org/events/2023-fall-plenary-session

c. CCC AO report (Plug)

i. Cal-GETC Implementation and Student Challenges: We’ve been focusing on the implementation of the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) and its potential challenges for students. Specifically, the Cal-GETC requires students to earn a minimum grade of “C” in all courses. This means that students with a “D” or “C-” in a general education (GE) area must either retake the course or transfer without receiving certification or an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT).

ii. Impact on JST and CLEP Credit: We’ve also been discussing how students with Joint Services Transcripts (JST) might encounter difficulties, as California community colleges are not able to certify students who we have awarded CPL credit too for Cal-GETC certification. The same situation applies to CLEP credit, which disproportionately affects non-traditional and Military/Veteran students.

iii. Institutional Credit and UCs: We’ve noted that while CSUs and CCCs have agreed to accept Institutional Accreditation (covering both National and Regional Accreditation), UCs do not share this stance. The revised standards will specify only schools with Regional Accreditation can be used for certification. The results for students are the same for students who possess, Military Credit, CLEP, has a D or C-in a course: Students will need to decide if they will transfer with certification and an ADT, or take additional coursework.
iv. **Certification Challenges:** The limitations on courses eligible for Cal-GETC certification could result in more students transferring without certification or ADT’s. How will the CSUs plan to address this issue to ensure students do not experience delays in their academic progress? How do we advise students?

v. **Partial/Area Certification Advocacy:** Partial Certification/Area Certification are areas of discussion. The Cal-GETC is taking an all or nothing approach here. This does not provide students with protection for courses passed along from other colleges and who go in without full certification. There may be many reasons why a student may not go in fully certified, some are listed above because of the Cal-GETC limitations. Can we advocate for partial/Area Certification in these areas?

vi. **Catalog Rights Alignment:** As we move forward with Cal-GETC, is there the potential for CCCs, CSUs, and UCs to align catalog rights. Can catalog rights include dually enrolled students?

vii. **Cal-GETC Standards 2.0:** We’re eagerly awaiting information on when the updated Cal-GETC standards (Cal-GETC 2.0) will be released. This information will guide our interactions with faculty regarding necessary adjustments to their courses.

viii. **Submission Procedures for Cal-GETC:** What will be the procedures for submitting courses for Cal-GETC.

ix. **CSUGE Attributes and Phase-Out Considerations:** Will there be a phase-out date for CSUGE (California State University General Education) attributes and the potential impact on students with existing catalog rights.

x. **AB 1111:** Lastly, AB 1111 has been a contentious and prominent topic within our discussions.

xi. These discussions reflect our ongoing commitment to improving articulation processes and providing robust support for students as they navigate their educational pathways. No report. No one has been named.

d. **CSU AO report (S. Wood)**

   i. CSUAO group did not meet in September or October. Our Fall CSUAO meeting was moved to November, so no new items to report from this
group yet with the exception of the ASSIST update below.

ii. CSUAO’s are currently focused on creating new articulation agreements by major and department for the 23-24 academic year in the new, modernized ASSIST system. The ASSIST ACS team estimates we will be able to start publishing new articulation agreements in mid-November. Agreement availability on the public site will vary by CSU campus initially as campuses complete the transition to the new modernized ASSIST system.

e. CSU Office of the Chancellor (Foster)

i. The CO continues to meet with GEAC and ASCSU reps to discuss Cal-GETC and CSU GE Breadth.
   • Intention to meet weekly to ensure comprehensive conversation.

ii. An intersegmental workgroup has been established to address implementation of Cal-GETC. Quajuana and Marci, along with faculty member Greg Wood, are meeting to determine how best to complete the work required now that Cal-GETC has been solidified.
   • In the process of getting a date fixed to meet.
   • Asked how long this committee will be in place. Will be an end date but hard to tell when that will be. Critical that everyone is on the same page for implementation.
   • Greg Wood asked to update GEAC at the next meeting.

iii. A collaborative presentation on Cal-GETC and CSU GE Breadth will be offered during the Board of Trustees meeting Tuesday November 7th. This is an informational item only. Should be around 2:20 pm.

iv. Chancellor Garcia has hit the ground running and shared a dozen priorities that she wants to address in her first 6 months. Two of those priorities revolve around enrollment. An important stat related to enrollment and GE involves reduced transfer rates. If this trend continues and the CSUs wind up taking more first time first year students, this will impact GE offerings. There could be a future Golden4 bottleneck, for example.
   • Note regarding impact on GE would still hold if we continue to bring in more first time students than transfer.
• Definition of a transfer student? Complex. Document being worked on that addresses this and delineates different paths.

v. We continue to send our colleague Marci Sanchez and Kristin Van Gaasbeck to regular AB 1111 Common Course Numbering meetings.

vi. Our office continues to utilize the ASCSU to solicit and confirm faculty participation on C-ID, CORE (Course Outline of Record Evaluator) and FDRG.

• ASCSU Exec involved in appointing members.

vii. Cambridge International reached back out on October 18th to share that ACE now recommends college course credit for 17 subjects that they offer with required AS and A level exam grades of e/E and higher. acenet.edu/National-Guide/Pages/Organization.aspx?oid=51af64b0-6f0d-ea11-a811-000d3a3786fc They continue to want GEAC to endorse their offerings beyond what has already been established through ACE. It is possible that CI will be given some time at a future GEAC meeting.

• https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/13630631/latest/
• https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/13340146/latest/

f. CSU Students (CSSA) (Pompa)
   i. Pending.

g. CSU Academic Senate (ASCSU) (Steffel)
   i. Pending.

h. JEDI Report (Nakano)
   i. Nothing to report but will take questions, issues, comments back to JEDI.
   ii. Chair asked JEDI to consider email from a student as to the adverse impact of losing Area E would impact Athletes especially underrepresented student athletes.

i. Chair covered looking at standards for Cal_GETC standards (need report). Looking at areas 2 - 5; don’t expect a lot of changes. Will follow the same procedures as for area 1.

j. Admission Advisory Council Report (Van Selst)
   i. Link to report.
8. LUNCH (noon - 1 pm)
9. Introduction to the Chancellor's Office charge to GEAC for 2023/24 released on 9/21/23
   a. Unpacking the charge by Interim AVC Massa
      i. The Chancellor is looking for this body to provide information the Chancellor should then provide to the BOT in this case concerning AB928. What has the group learned in its consultation with constituents? What is the majority/minority position/opinion? Framed as a statement for the chancellor to use in the chancellor’s advice to the BOT - chancellor can use the information at her discretion.
      ii. Have to update transfer criteria but what are the specific changes? What are the different perspectives around implementing the legislation and GE Breadth?
      iii. Will admission requirements change? There are a multitude of paths into the CSU including and beyond the ADT route. Goes into effect Fall 2025 and catalog rights will be a factor. Dual enrollment students and catalog rights? Based on the path a student follows, what options are open to students with respect to GE? This needs to be reflected in the changes to Title 5. What advice would this committee provide using a GE lens?
      iv. Numerous places where Title 5 has to be updated.
      v. CSU GE breadth being removed from CCC. CSU still has this but do we modify it? Mirror Cal-GETC?
      vi. Cal-GETC removed partial certification. Precludes students who previously could get partial or Area certification and transfer (e.g., veteran students, credit for prior learning). What would be the paths for these students?
      vii. How can students not Cal-GETC certified transfer to the CSU? Is this an option? Moved past the curriculum required for admission to admission criteria.
viii. Small proportion of students coming in who would need to take the
current full CSU GE breadth.
ix. Need to make sure students get credit for work they have done.
x. Does AB928 impose the same admissions standards for the UC and
CSU? **Curriculum** is the same but admissions criteria can be
applied differently - two different documents. CA Master Plan notes
different admission standards for each system. Have these
documents been conflated (and gone beyond the legislation) and
combined so just the one **document** at the moment. In changing
Title 5 don’t have to include these admission requirements (GPA).
If just one document, does a student have to meet the UC set
standards to get ADT certified? Requirements for a local
Associate's Degree? If you don’t get Cal-GETC you don’t get the
ADT. Implications for entry into the CSU? Can still transfer but
ADT comes with a number of benefits that make it worth pursuing.

xi. UC doesn’t currently have an ADT program - working on this with
new legislation (AB1291). Currently ADT only transfers into the CSU.

2. Discussion items:

b. GEAC’s charge by CO - formulating a response for the December 15, 2023
deadline

i. Cal-GETC doesn’t meet the needs of our students. If we go down
separate paths does this open the door to more legislation.

ii. What is in the purview of this committee versus ICAS? Is the focus
here to align CSU breadth with Cal-GETC? Ask ASCSU to weigh in
on the alignment question. Curriculum belongs to the faculty.
ASCSU be deferred too on this question.

iii. If one pattern and that is Cal-GETC, it doesn’t seem to make sense,
you would have different standards for CSU and UC on the required
courses.

iv. Create a googledoc to document ideas on this question.

v. How unified are faculty? High unit majors might be motivated to
use the ‘freed’ units and would seek alignment. Would you get a
consensus? How do we reach out to the faculty and sample those who would oppose versus support? Need time to get a clear view.

vi. If getting ADT contingent on the higher grade threshold, what is the impact numerically in terms of the number of students who would have the ADT to apply? Small percentage transfer with IGETC.

vii. Legislation seems clear that the goal is to have the ADT as the primary path into the UC and/or the CSU. Curriculum versus standards debate.

viii. Multiple ways to transfer. Not everyone will take the ADT route and so we need a path for these students.

ix. Trying to fix a bad law (look at the number of hours we have put into trying to figure out how to implement the law). If we remove the question of grades and focus on the curriculum and grade standards removed from the ICAS document, does this help move us forward?

x. What is the purpose of GE? Breadth of knowledge? What does a grade per course versus an overall average tell us about having met GE?

xi. Does the legislation eviscerate any other GE pathway to transfer? You can get in, but wouldn’t be GE certified. Could still give the credit for GE but after admission.

xii. Student perspective on all of this? Back to the question of what is a transfer student?

xiii. Transfer students outside of CA? What standards now and in the future? Implications? How far into the weeds do we get? How far downstream do we go?

xiv. What to put in the report - start with googledoc. Another meeting? Themes from today? Getting broader input? Need to frame as a need for more time? Do both - what was discussed today but more time to wrap this up? Document that more time would lead to a more informed recommendation. Can narrow by indicating need to go to ICAS to change the grade conundrum. Focus more on the alignment with CSU GE and Cal-GETC for transfer - but don’t do
more at this time on CSU breadth and first time students. Make visible what the ‘real’ concerns are in terms of implementation.

xv. Second part of charge around updating TMCs. Does this impact the question of GE compliance? Focus of Part II of charge is on resources needed.

xvi. Timeline for googledoc - report due 12/15; document open to 11/21 from 2 - 4 pm to meet to go through the document and vote.

c. Cal-GETC and CSU GE changes -- meetings with CO, AA, and GEAC (last meeting on October 27)

i. AA’s proposed resolutions
   • Provide suggestions to AA - not purview of this ad hoc group to do so. Maybe working on a resolution but still much we don’t know.
   • Focus on wider consultation about the alignment.

ii. AA’s proposed changes to documents related to BOT meeting in November in the making and what transpired
   • Jessie Ryan Executive VP for the Campaign for College Opportunity presented on the history of AB928 and the intent of the legislation and Galilea Pompa presented the student perspective.
      o Need for clean up legislation (Ryan) even though she noted Berman happy with the legislation. Focus more on clean up only if we didn't follow through for transfer.
      o Implementation: trying to mitigate the potential unintended consequences of the legislation.
      o Some contradictory responses.
      o For the future, how to be more involved earlier to avoid the unintended consequences of legislation.

   One of the Chancellor's 12 priorities is to rebuild trust with a number of constituents.

   • There was also an opportunity for discussion on what was presented. First time students and GE is still an open
question. Still unclear as to exactly how this will unfold and where ultimately authority lies? How strong is HEERA? What is meant by consultation? Are we all on the same page?

10. Credit by examination (annual review – discussion led by MVS)
   a. Part of the GEAC charge is to look at credit by examination and other mechanisms. Some aspects of this APEP would need to review.
   b. UC doesn’t like skill based-courses or testing out by examination. How does this sit with Cal-GETC?
   c. Need to advocate for, perhaps an APEP item, for inclusion. CCC credit for prior learning. What will Cal-GETC do with this? How to evaluate this?
   d. The ask is that GEAC look at the question of credit by examination and the College Board and International baccalaureates. Argument for a CSU separate evaluation system.
   e. Marci Sanchez been seeking such information from the College Board and be added to a listserv for AP updates (must exist as other entities get these). AP African-American studies update being pursued.
   f. For Cal-GETC number of descriptors some haven’t yet been discussed - clarified earlier in this meeting by Chair that these are under discussion. Rest of the document will be under review next semester (Spring 2024).
   g. Want to preserve credit by examination for CSU students.

11. Adjournment (3.50) Approved.

Invited guests:
Interim AVC Massa

Standing guests:
Steffel, Beth ASCSU, Chair
bsteffel@calstate.edu
Tabitha Hart ASCSU, sub for Mark Van Selst in Fall 2023
Dana Nakano? ASCSU, JEDI liaison
Kevin Kaatz Chair, CSU GE Council
kevin.kaatz@csueastbay.edu
Inouye, Caron  
CSU CO, Associate Dean, Academic Programs, Curriculum and Assessment

cinouye@calstate.edu

Chapman, Quajuana  
CSU CO, Assistant Director, General Education and Intersegmental Partnerships

qchapman@calstate.edu

Marci Sanchez  
CSU CO, Assistant Director Undergraduate Transfer Programs

msanchez@calstate.edu

Raul Arambula  
CCCCO, Dean, Educational Services

rarambula@ccccco.edu

Bob Quinn  
CCCCO, Specialist, Educational Services and Support Division

bquinn@ccccco.edu
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